[Page 55]

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, we present the several recommendations that represent means for implementing the seven principles presented in the prior section. There [are] a total of 27 recommendations. The first 12 of them relates to Principle #1; the next 6, to Principle #2; the next 5, to Principle #3; the next 3, to Principle #5; the last one, to Principle #7. For a variety of reasons, we did not develop recommendations for the other principles. Several of the recommendations are closely related, so they will be discussed together to emphasize that relationship.

Each of these recommendations has been accepted by the Task Force, most of them by near unanimity or at least substantial majority, although two (#10 and #23) represented a significant division between majority and minority. Table 3 provides a tabulation of the votes taken on each of them.

For each recommendation, we will present the wording as accepted by the Task Force. (In a few cases, the wording presented here is slightly different from that which actually was voted on, since the final wording was left to the editorial committee, but the substance has been preserved.) We will present a review of the discussion leading to the votes on the groups, identifying the reasons for the majority view and, where appropriate, the minority views. We will conclude with a discussion of the means that we may have identified for implementation of the recommendation.

OVERVIEW.

Principle #1.
[1.]   Environment to Enhance Competition
[2.]   Applicability of First Amendment
[3.]   Consistency in Congressional Actions.
[4.]   Efficient Information Technologies
[5.]   Standards
[6.]   Education; Research
[7.]   Statistics; Economic Assessment
[8.]   Means of Dissemination
Principle #2.
[1.]   Legal & Regulatory Barriers
[2.]   Encouragement to "Add Value" and
[3.]   Private Sector Involvement
Principle #3.
[1.]   Procedures to Evaluate "Compelling Reasons"
[2.]   Enhancement of Information Products & Services
Principle #5.
[1.] Announce Availability
[2.] Deposit at National & Regional Centers
[3.] Federal Domestic Copyrights

Principle #7.
[1.] Use of Private Sector Dissemination Means [Page 56]

Table 3. Summary of Votes on Recommendations[†]

Recommendation	Yes	No	Abstain	Not Present
1	11	0	1	4
2	11	0	1	4
3	12	0	1	3
4	12	0	0	4
5	12	0	I	3
6	11	0	3	2
7	11	0	3	2
8	14	0	0	2
9	10	0	5	1
[‡] 10	8	6	0	2
11	13	0	0	3
12	11	2	1	2
13	13	0	0	3
14	12	0	0	4
15	13	0	0	3
16	12	0	0	4
17	11	0	0	5
18	11	1	0	4
19	12	1	2	I
20	13	1	1	1
21	14	1	0	1
22	16	0	0	0
[‡] 23	9	7	0	0
24	15	0	0	1
25	10	3	2	1
26	10	2	2	2
27	12	1	0	3

[†] Of the members of the Task Force 16 participated in the meeting at which votes were taken on the recommendations. During the meeting varying numbers of them were participants in each vote. The column "Not Present" indicates how many were not there during a given vote.

[‡] Of the 27 recommendations the votes on two — 10 and 23 — represented a significant division within the Task Force. Number 10 is concerned with "encouraging Federal agencies to regard dissemination of information as a high priority" and number 23 is concerned with "not arbitrarily restricting the Federal government from enhancing information products and services."

[Page 57]

PRINCIPLE #1.

[1.]   ENVIRONMENT TO ENHANCE COMPETITION.

>   Recommendation #1. Provide an environment that will enhance the competitive forces of the private sector, so that the market mechanisms can be effective in allocating resources in the use of information and in directing innovation into market determined areas.

DISCUSSION. The discussion of this recommendation was concerned solely with minor changes in wording. Responsibility was given the Editorial Committee to decide on the final wording, preserving the essential import. The abstention was because of concern about the final wording and a desire to have a vote on that final wording.

IMPLEMENTATION. This is a general recommendation. Implementation will require that Congress, the Executive branch agencies, the independent agencies, and the NCLIS all recognize the increasing role of information as an economic resource.

[2.]   APPLICABILITY OF FIRST AMENDMENT.

>   Recommendation #2. Affirm the applicability of the First Amendment to information products and services.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started with the recommendation in the form:

>   Provide consistency with respect to regulation of information activities.

A strong argument was presented that there should be no regulation. But examples were given of situations, such as broadcast channels, in which it is generally accepted that regulation is needed, and there was discussion of alternative means for handling those situations. The meaning of the word "consistency" was discussed, and the definition "not differentially applied" was suggested.

But the discussion then took a quite dramatic turn, as the group tried to deal with the basis for the desire for "no regulation". A distinction was made between "regulation of content" and "regulation of resources"; the view was expressed that there should be no regulation of content and that regulation of scarce resources should be consistent.

There was concern expressed about the clarity of the wording and need to see examples of application. Specific situations were discussed:

- "Equal time" regulations, representing control of scarce resources, not content.
- "Obscenity", "fraud", and "libel", representing issues that are handled by criminal and civil law and do not [Page 58] represent prior control.

- National security issues (perhaps as exemplified by the Pentagon Papers case), representing another class of problems but within the general scope of First Amendment cases.

The crucial point made appeared to be this: There is debate about the extent to which "freedom of the press" should be interpreted broadly or be limited to the printed newspaper. The Task Force, in making this recommendation, is not attempting to resolve the legal issues involved, but is attempting to state its views that "information", taken broadly, should be protected by the same rights that would apply to "the press", even in the narrowest of the interpretations. The example of the "broadcast model" was contrasted with the "press model", and the general view was that the press model should apply to information products and services in general, with recognition that regulation of scarce resources may be necessary, but that there should be no regulation of content.

IMPLEMENTATION. This may well be a recommendation that will require action by the judiciary, although Congress might consider legislation that would embody the view that all information products and services should fall under the protection of the First Amendment.

[3.]   CONSISTENCY IN CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS.

> Recommendation #3. Encourage Congress to be consistent in the language used and in the application of principles relating to information products and services, such as those identified in this Report, when it formulates legislation and when it exercises its oversight role.

DISCUSSION. As a result of the discussion of the applicability of the recommendations to the full range of government activities, this additional recommendation was drafted for consideration in the context of Principle #1. There was concern expressed with the fact that legislation rarely refers to specific information products or services; instead, it defines functions. This recommendation must therefore be seen as expressing concern not only with the actual specifications that may occur in legislation but with the subsequent means for actually implementing those functional specifications.

There was discussion of the intent of this recommendation. Why the concern with consistency in language? It was pointed out that the legislation has not been consistent in the past, that terms like "information center" have been used without a clear and consistent definition of them.

IMPLEMENTATION. This recommendation is directed specifically at Congress. Implementation will require careful review by appropriate staff of all Congressional committees of the information aspects of legislation. [Page 59]

[4.]   EFFICIENT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

> Recommendation #4. Encourage government agencies to utilize the most efficient (information) technologies.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started with the recommendation expressed in the following form:

> Encourage government agencies to utilize new information technologies for increased efficiency of operation and as a means for encouraging innovation.

The first question raised was the extent to which the purchasing power of the government should be used for purposes of encouraging development. It was pointed out that this recommendation, in that respect, deals with two quite distinct things: use of the best means and use of the purchasing power. The decision was made to deal first with the use of "best means".

The wording was discussed. For example, should the issue of "make or buy" be included? Should the limitation to "internal operations" be stressed? Finally, a formal vote was taken with the wording as given above.

The issue of whether the government's purchasing power should be used to encourage innovation was then discussed. It was pointed out that the government is a major force in the marketplace and, as part of the market forces, helps determine the allocation of resources. Government decisions, if indeed based on efficiency, would represent a very desirable participation of government in the marketplace, on the demand side.

IMPLEMENTATION. Congressional action may be required to correct existing legislation that impedes the introduction of efficient technologies. The OMB should consider regulations that encourage the Executive branch agencies to utilize efficient technologies. The NCLIS could initiate studies of the basis for evaluating the relative efficiency of various information technologies. The several agencies, both Executive branch and independent, could initiate programs of evaluation and, if appropriate, replacement of existing technologies.

[5.]   STANDARDS.

Recommendation #5. Encourage the setting and use of voluntary standards that will not inhibit the further development of innovative information products and services.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started with the following:

Encourage the setting of standards for information equipment, products, and services.

It was pointed out that the freezing of practice into standards can have a stultifying effect upon development and innovation. In contrast, it was [Page 60] pointed out that at least a minimal set of standards are essential if there is to be progress, and that there was a prevailing view that standards are a good thing. It would be most important for us to identify anything that makes this field different. Concern was expressed about implying that the government should set standards, since there are already in being mechanisms by which the private sector goes about the setting of standards.

It was pointed out that [Public Law] 96-511 (the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980) calls for the OMB to set standards for government agencies; these could have dramatic impact upon the private sector, because of the sheer size of the government enterprise. In the discussion, it was suggested that the focus of the OMB will be on standards related to governmental reporting and auditing; on the other hand, it was pointed out that [Public Law] 96-511 calls for standards across the board. It was suggested that the OMB should encourage private sector review and input to the standards setting process of the government. The abstention reflected a concern that the recommendation would be viewed as showing naïveté about the process by which standards are developed. The importance of involving the private sector in governmental decisions about internal government-set standards was re-emphasized.

IMPLEMENTATION. The National Bureau of Standards [renamed the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) in 1988] could initiate studies of the specific status of standards, especially with respect to software and procedures, in the areas of information products and services.

[6.]   EDUCATION; RESEARCH

> Recommendation #6. Encourage and support educational programs that provide the professional skills needed to further the development of information as an economic and social resource.

> Recommendation #7. Encourage and support both basic and applied research in library and information science.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started with the following texts:

> Support education programs that provide the professional manpower needed to further the development of information as an economic and social resource.

> Support pure and applied research in library and information science, to develop the knowledge on which further innovations can be based.

These represent not the entry of the government into the marketplace, but means by which the government can help develop the infrastructure on which these products and services will be based. It was suggested that the phrase "encourage and support" replace simply "support", since much more is involved than simply financial support. [Page 61]

The abstainers pointed out that the trend was toward "block grants", rather than grants for such specific, even parochial purposes; it was questioned whether there in fact was a problem that required government action. It was pointed out, in response, that manpower development is a part of the framework represented by Principle #1, that there has been an enormous growth in the demand for people in the information professions. Concern was then expressed about the term "manpower" in the recommendation as phrased, and the suggestion was made that "professional skills" be substituted (the view being that we want to upgrade knowledge, not simply provide bodies).

IMPLEMENTATION. The Congress could review legislation related to education and research in library and information science, with the view toward improving the level and quality of support for them. The agencies currently involved in such support — Department of Education, National Science Foundation, and National Library of Medicine, especially — could review their programs and priorities on allocation of resources.

[7.]   STATISTICS; ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT.

> Recommendation #8. Encourage and support statistical programs and related research to provide the data needed to deal with information policy issues.

> Recommendation #9. Conduct a periodic economic assessment of the impact of Federal government information products and services.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started from the following:

> Support research and statistical programs to provide the data needed to deal with information policy issues.

There should be a continuing economic assessment of the impact of Federal government information products and services, in the form of an "output" analysis as part of the gross national product.

It was pointed out that these recommendations reflected the gap in knowledge concerning the impact of information as an economic and social resource. They are related to Recommendation #5, but they need to be stated and emphasized separately from it. It was suggested that, in parallel with those, the word "encourage" be added. Concern was expressed that getting the data required might create its own burdens. It was pointed out that each of these recommendations should be seen within the context of the others, rather than in isolation.

IMPLEMENTATION. The Congress could establish requirements for reporting of statistical data on the "information economy" and on the information activities of Federal agencies. The agencies in the Executive branch and the independent agencies most directly concerned with monitoring of the economy could institute studies of the data needed to evaluate these economic [Page 62] effects. The OMB could require that Executive branch agencies institute such evaluations.

[8.]   MEANS OF DISSEMINATION.

Recommendation #10. Encourage Federal agencies to regard the dissemination of information, especially through the mechanisms of the private sector (both for profit and not for profit), as a high priority responsibility.

Recommendation #11. Identify and evaluate alternatives to existing Federal information dissemination mechanisms.

Recommendation #12. Develop and support the use of libraries as active means for access to governmental information by the public.

DISCUSSION. Concern was expressed that these might be taken out of context, and that the parenthetical phrase "especially through ..." might be ignored. The discussion brought out virtually every one of the many issues with which the Task Force has been concerned, especially with respect to the responsibility of government to make information readily available (including the concerns about what information was to be included). Some members of the Task Force felt that the purpose of the recommendation was met elsewhere, that the term "dissemination" implied too much.

Those voting in favor of Recommendation #10 felt that openness of government operations was essential, and that the government should encourage the use of information derived from governmental operations rather than simply being a passive source. Those voting against the recommendation felt that "active" operations on the part of government tended to become self-perpetuating bureaucracies.

This discussion thus led to Recommendation #11 and, since libraries are regarded by the Task Force as an essential component of the system for public access to government information, to Recommendation #12. Although Recommendation #12 duplicates what Principle #7 emphasizes, the Task Force felt it was important to include it as part of the general environment for encouraging development and use of information products and services.

IMPLEMENTATION. This could be implemented by Congressional action requiring the review of current methods for dissemination and evaluation of alternatives. On the other hand, it could be accomplished by OMB regulations.

PRINCIPLE #2.

[1.]   LEGAL & REGULATORY BARRIERS.

Recommendation #13. Identify and eliminate legal and regulatory barriers to the introduction of new information products and services. [Page 63]

DISCUSSION. The discussion started from the following:

Reduce the "information overload" represented by excessive paperwork, especially for small organizations, so as to facilitate the entry of new companies into the field of information products and services, thus providing for increased competition and innovation.

First, the wording was discussed, with emphasis on what is cause and what is effect. The suggestion was made that the text should end at "...services"; that the sequence of phrases should be reversed; that the goal is "increased competition and innovation", not simply "reduction in paperwork".

But then the discussion became very substantive. What is the purpose of this recommendation? Is there really a problem with respect to paperwork (presumably from governmental requirements)? Reference was made to the paperwork reduction act, to the estimate that "the public will spend 1.2 billion hours filling out forms", to the view that this is especially a burden for small companies.

It was suggested that the real purpose of this recommendation is the encouragement of entry of small new companies, that much of the information industry is "cottage industry", and that government has a role in providing an environment in which it can flourish. But it was then suggested that "new companies" be replaced by "new products and services", since growth of new companies could be counter-productive, leading to economic losses, especially in areas where there is no economic viability for small enterprise. It was pointed out that such a view appeared to be counter to the whole basis for the private enterprise approach.

IMPLEMENTATION. Requires action by Congress in identifying such barriers, by the OMB in establishing regulations that will eliminate barriers in the bureaucratic process, by the NCLIS in initiating studies that will assist both Congress and the OMB.

[2.]   ENCOURAGEMENT TO "ADD VALUE" AND TO DISSEMINATE

Recommendation #14. Encourage private enterprise to "add value" to government information (i.e., to re-package it, provide further processing services, and otherwise enhance the information so that it can be sold at a profit).

Recommendation #15. Provide incentives to existing organizations, such as libraries and bookstores, that will encourage them to expand their activities in dissemination of governmentally distributable information.

DISCUSSION. Question was raised about whether Recommendation #14 really was necessary, since nothing in law or practice would prevent it, but it was pointed out that there have been efforts to prevent private sector enhancement. [Page 64]

Question was raised about the form of incentives. The example of quantity discounts for bookstores was given. But what would be the incentives for libraries? The text of the

recommendations that have been replaced by the above includes reference to the costs of providing depository library services, and question was raised about whether we are proposing subsidies. It was suggested that rather than subsidies, we could be dealing with compensation for services provided. The example of the Regional Medical Library Network was cited. Contracting with libraries for such services might be funded by the funds currently used to support Federal activities providing the services that could better be provided by libraries.

IMPLEMENTATION. This could involve Congressional action, but the most direct means for implementation is through actions by the several Federal agencies. Beyond that, the private sector itself needs to take an active role in exploiting the opportunities, in developing the new products and services, in creating the added values.

INVOLVEMENT OF PRIVATE SECTOR.

Recommendation #16. Establish procedures which will create a realistic opportunity for private sector involvement in the planning process for information activities.

Recommendation #17. Involve the private sector in the process of formulating Federal standards relating to information activities.

Recommendation #18. Create or improve mechanisms for ensuring that the actions of government agencies, in developing information resources, products, and services are consistent with the policies, goals, and long range plans that are announced.

DISCUSSION. The purpose of these recommendations is to assure that everyone with an interest in a government action has the opportunity to express a point of view. But there is more involved than simply that. In fact, there are at least three objectives: 1) to assure adequate opportunity for debate, 2) to reduce the uncertainties in making private investment, and 3) to reduce the interference of government plans with the development of private sector products and services. The wording was extensively discussed, with a number of alternative phrasings presented:

- "Announce potential and planned...activities..."
- "...with sufficient warning to provide a debate forum..."
- "...devise procedures for expressing perceived needs..."
- "...consider the impact of announcements before making them..."
- "...orderly planning process, allowing for periodic review from the private sector and input from them so that..."
- "...create a realistic opportunity for private sector involvement..." [Page 65]

A crucial issue was the scope of coverage of the term "government agency", with the view that Congress and the judiciary should be subject to the same requirement. The concern was especially with respect to actions by Congress in mandating such activities as "information dissemination" and "establishment of clearinghouses" in new legislation. The issue is primarily with the proliferation of new, autonomous mechanisms rather than using the ones which are already in place.

It was pointed out that the Paperwork Reduction Act has specific language relevant to all of this:

> "...shall provide interested agencies and persons with early and meaningful opportunity to comment..."

and the Task Force feels that this is of special importance with respect to this recommendation.

PRINCIPLE #3.

[1.]   PROCEDURES TO EVALUATE "COMPELLING REASONS".

> Recommendation #19. Announce plans sufficiently ahead of time to provide an opportunity for private sector involvement when a government agency, for reasons it regards as compelling, should plan to develop and/or market an information product or service.

> Recommendation #20. Review and approve, before implementation, any plans for the government to develop and/or market an information product or service, the review to be carried out by an agency appropriate to the branch of government (such as OMB, GAO, CBO).

> Recommendation #21. Include an "information impact and cost analysis" as part of the process of review, evaluation, and approval of any plans for the government to develop and/or market an information product or service, the analysis to cover economic and social effects; effects on any existing products and services; effects on potential products and services; and an evaluation of the benefits to the public.

> Recommendation #22. Review periodically to evaluate the desirability of continuation of any product or service as a governmental activity.

DISCUSSION. These four recommendations embody the procedures that the Task Force feels are essential to the process of determining whether there are "compelling reasons" for the government to provide information products and/or services in commerce. The discussion of them started from the following draft statements: [Page 66]

> Any such plans should be reviewed and approved by an appropriate agency (such as OMB).

> Part of the evaluation of any such plans should be an "impact analysis" that would consider the economic and social effects of the proposed service, both positive and negative. This should include an evaluation of the effects on any products and services, especially those in the private sector; an evaluation of potential private sector products and services that could be expected to result; an evaluation of the benefits to the public from the availability of the government information.

> There should be a periodic review to evaluate the desirability of continuation of the product or service as a governmental activity versus leaving it to the private sector or discontinuing it completely.

The language was discussed:

- "...before implementation..."
- "...by an agency appropriate to the branch of government..."
- Delete "such"

The NO vote on these recommendations reflected a concern about the level of detail implied by it. Thus if it were interpreted as applying to individual publications, it would be an administrative nightmare. It was pointed out that such was unlikely to be the case, that approval for a general

program should then embody approval of specific products or services within it. With that interpretation, the requirement for review would protect against abuse. (It was pointed out, though, that most immediately, the OMB is requiring that individual publications must get separate approval.) The Task Force therefore, in a formal vote, adopted the following statement:

> The Task Force would be concerned if these recommendations were interpreted as forcing individual publications to be included in the review process.

Concern continued to be expressed about the interpretation of the context or frame of reference for the recommendations of the Task Force. The following was presented and approved in a formal vote:

> When the Task Force refers to government agencies or activities, it is the intention that the reference be to all agencies of government — legislative, executive, and judicial branches and to the independent agencies.

It was pointed out that there is a converse to Recommendation #22. There should also be periodic review of the effectiveness of the private sector services that might take over a government service, to assure that they [Page 67] indeed carry out the objectives, that the government data is not misused, and that the original intent was not abused. This was countered with concern about government monitoring of private sector operations. But there clearly are conflicting concerns. On the one hand, we want to be sure that government data are not perverted; on the other hand, we want to avoid the "big brother" effect. This discussion was resolved in the following distinction. The review process being considered in this recommendation is external to the agency, and it would be inappropriate for that review body to assess the effectiveness of private sector operations subsequently. On the other hand, it would be quite appropriate for the government agency with a mission to evaluate whether the information needs for its mission are adequately met by the private sector replacement; if not, there would be a basis for proposing re-introduction of the service.

[2.]   ENHANCEMENT.

> Recommendation #23. Do not arbitrarily restrict the Federal government from enhancement of information products and services, even if solely to meet the needs of constituencies outside the government itself.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started from the following:

> The Federal agency should refrain from enhancement of information products and services solely to meet the needs of constituencies outside the government itself.

This recommendation was the most controversial of all of them. An immediate vote was taken, without any significant discussion of wording, with the result that this wording was rejected by a vote of 6 YES to 9 NO. The initial decision was to have this result presented in the Report, with the minority position (the vote in favor) represented by appropriate text.

However, the minority in favor of the original wording suggested that the recommendation be reconsidered, in the negative wording finally selected. The intent of the recommendation in this form was then discussed. It was pointed out that if there was abuse of the enhancement, it would be subject to the review process spelled out in prior recommendations. After that discussion the final vote was taken.

PRINCIPLE #5.

[1.]   ANNOUNCEMENT OF AVAILABILITY.

> Recommendation #24. Announce the availability of governmentally distributable information and maintain one or more registers to help the public determine what governmentally distributable information is available. [Page 68]

DISCUSSION. The discussion started from the following:

> The availability of government information should be announced, and one (or more) registers should be maintained of all government publications and other forms.

It was pointed out that this recommendation, like all of the others, must be handled within the context of the entire set of principles, not in isolation. There remains the problem of information that has already been acquired outside the framework of these principles.

The wording of the recommendation was discussed:

- "...information products and services..."
- End it after "...maintained"?
- How about availability of raw data?
- Why should government create a register? Why not private sector?

[2.]   DEPOSIT AT NATIONAL & REGIONAL CENTERS.

> Recommendation #25. Deposit governmentally distributable information, in whatever form it may be available, at national and regional centers, including regional depository libraries, where it may be examined at no charge.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started from the following:

> The Federal government should deposit government information, in whatever form it may be available, at national and regional centers (including depository libraries), where it may be examined at no charge and reproduced at the costs of reproduction.

Question was raised about the relationship between this recommendation and the preceding one. Don't they represent alternatives? It was pointed out that the nature of the depository library system is that some depositories may elect to take only specific items, so they need to have the indexes or registers for access to other materials.

Question was raised as to why this recommendation should be considered. The response was that the balance between the use of the private sector and the maintenance of public access requires that there be a public "safety valve", a means of guaranteeing that there is some means by which access to governmentally distributable information can be assured. The library system of the country provides that guarantee.

Question was raised about the inclusion of data bases in this recommendation. Presently the depository library system is limited to GPO publications. This recommendation would broaden that in several ways. It was pointed out that there are technological implications in providing means for examination of non-printed forms. [Page 69]

The point was made that the depository library system represents an underdeveloped, under-supported facility that could be improved as a most cost-effective way of accomplishing the objectives of public access to government information.

The wording of this recommendation was then discussed:

- "...selected national and regional..."

- End after "...at no charge..."

- "...including regional depository libraries..."

[3.]   FEDERAL DOMESTIC COPYRIGHTS.

Recommendation #26. Do not assert any Federal government copyrights on information the Federal government makes domestically available.

DISCUSSION. The discussion started from the following:

Government and public information made available by the Federal government should be free of domestic copyright.

There was considerable discussion of the problem of controlling non-domestic distribution if there is no domestic control. It was pointed out that the important value of copyright in this context is the protection of the integrity of the information. It was pointed out that international aspects are outside the scope of the work of the Task Force.

Examples were given in which private sector information enters the stream of government information (quotations by a congressman in the *Congressional [Record]*, for example), to point up the fact that distribution by the government doesn't mean free of copyright. This highlighted what the real objective is, and led to the final wording, on which a formal vote was taken.

PRINCIPLE #7.

[1.]   USE OF PRIVATE SECTOR DISSEMINATION MEANS.

Recommendation #27. Use the nation's libraries and non-governmental information centers as means for distribution of governmentally distributable information instead of creating new governmental units or expanding existing ones.

DISCUSSION. The following potential recommendations related to Principle #7 were considered:

Funding by the Federal government of costs involved in providing this service to the public in general. [Page 70]

Expanding the scope and range of the depository library system.

Encouraging libraries to develop services based on the new technologies (making the public library, in particular, the "electronic information center" for the general public in each community).

The costs of managing, cataloging, and maintaining the depository collections are often ignored, since they are not normally covered by the budgetary support from the principal source of funding for those libraries. Means should be found to provide support for those functions as part of the depository library system.

> Government publications themselves are not organized or distributed in a manner that makes the operation of depository libraries effective. While several of the recommendations of the Task Force may lead to steps that will alleviate this problem, specific attention needs to be paid, in implementation of them, to the needs of depository libraries.

> The present set of depository libraries (about 1300 of them) is only a small part of the total library community. Means should be found to expand the number and distribution of depository libraries.

It was suggested that all of these recommendations be replaced by the following, more general recommendation, with the libraries of the country being a specific, identified example:

> The Federal government, in considering information activities, should make maximum use of existing resources and information delivery mechanisms as primary means for information distribution.

The proliferation of Federal information centers and networks was cited to illustrate the import of this proposed recommendation. Examples of existing resources which could be used instead included the nation's libraries, book stores, etc.

Concern was expressed that this recommendation represented a focus on current or traditional mechanisms for information distribution. It thus fails to recognize the effects of new technology and the resulting changes in institutions.

Concern was expressed about limiting this statement to libraries, since there are many non-governmental information centers that would serve the same functions well. It was pointed out that the objective of the recommendation [Page 71] is to urge that these existing mechanisms be used rather than creating new ones. The result of the discussion was the final text, on which a formal vote was taken.

The NO vote reflected the view there are some kinds of information that are best distributed through Federal agencies. It was pointed out, while there may well be compelling reasons to use government agencies, that then falls within the scope of other principles.

[Page 72 – Blank]